

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/603,588 06/25/2003 Robert William Sutter 2006.66594 5864 **EXAMINER** 24978 7590 01/11/2005 GREER, BURNS & CRAIN CAO, HUEDUNG X 300 S WACKER DR ART UNIT PÁPER NUMBER 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606 2821

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/603,588	SUTTER ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Huedung X Cao	2821	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
Period fo	• •			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuting reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinoly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day it will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed  is will be considered timely. It the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 I</u>	November 2004		
	<u> </u>	is action is non-final.		
3)	·		peacution as to the marite is	
∪(≎	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
	siosed in decordance with the produce under	Ex parte Quayle, 1999 O.D. 11, 40	0.0.210.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application	n. ·		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) □ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.			
5)				
6)⊠				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)[	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	•*	
Applicati	on Papers			
_	The specification is objected to by the Examin	or		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.				
. • ,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• , ,	• •	
11)[	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
		Adminor. Note the attached office	7.70.1011 01 101111 1 10-102.	
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigi ☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (f).	
	<ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> </ol>			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	ority documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage	
	application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not receive	ed.	
٠			·	
Attachmen		7		
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
	e of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08		Patent Application (PTO-152)	
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-7, and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moore et al. (US 6369775).

With respect to claim 1, Moore teaches a multiple bandwidth antenna assembly comprising:

a helical radiator having at least a first helical pitch and a second helical pitch (piches sections 16, 18, and 20, column 2, line 55); a core plug having a first axial piece and a second axial piece that abut one another (core plug 14, column 2, line 53); and a first recessed pattern configured on said first axial piece to engage at least said first helical pitch and a second recessed pattern configured on said second axial piece to engage at least said second helical pitch (column 2, lines 51-60).

Claim 2 adds into claim 1, wherein said first axial piece and said second axial piece are configured to couple with one another (figure 1B; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 47).

Application/Control Number: 10/603,588

Art Unit: 2821

Claim 3 adds into claim 1, wherein said first axial piece and said second axial piece threadedly engage one another (figure 1B; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 47).

Claim 4 adds into claim 1, wherein said first axial piece and said second axial piece engage one another in a snap fit engagement (figure 1B; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 47).

Claim 5 adds into claim 1, wherein medial 2 ends of each of said first and second axial pieces are configured to matingly engage one another (figure 1B; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 47).

Claim 6 adds into claim 1, wherein medial 2 ends of each of said first and second axial pieces are configured to frictionally 3 engage one another (figure 1B; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 47).

Claim 7 adds into claim 1 wherein, medial 2 ends of each of said first and said second axial pieces are configured to be in 3 abutment with one another (figure 1B; column 2, line 61-column 3, line 47).

With respect to claims 12-15, wherein one of said first and second recessed patterns includes a second helical pitch, wherein said second recessed pattern is configured to engage both of said first and said second helical pitches, wherein said first and second recessed patterns each include a second helical pitch, wherein said helical radiator is configured to engage said first and second helical pitches and each of said first and second recessed patterns (figure 1B).

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior of are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been chained at the time the

Page 4

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Moore et al. (US 6369775).

With respect to claim 8, wherein medial 2 ends of each of said first axial piece

and said second axial piece are held in engagement by adhesion which Moore does not

explicitly disclose. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to use the adhesive to bond the helical radiators

together.

With respect to claim 9, wherein said 2 first helical pitch creates resonance at a

frequency of 1575MHz and a combination of said first helical pitch and said second

helical pitch creates resonance between 806 and 941 MHz which Moore does not

explicitly disclose. However, It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art to use different frequency, since it has been held that where the general

conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or working

ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

With respect to claims 10 and 11, wherein said second axial piece is made of a

relatively more elastic material than said first axial piece, and wherein said second axial

piece comprises Lexan 141 and said first axial piece comprises Texin 255 which Moore does not explicitly disclose. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the adhesive to bond the helical radiators together.

Claims 16-23 are similar in scope to claims 1-15; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason.

Claims 24-31 are similar in scope to claims 1-15; therefore, they are rejected for the same reason.

### Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/01/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Regarding claims 1, 16, 24 and 31, a phrase "a core plug having a first axial piece and a second axial piece that abut one another". Hence, examiner interpreted the phrase "a first axial piece and a second axial piece that abut one another" in the broadest sense. The "first axial piece and second axial piece" could be any sections 16, 18, and 20 of figure 1B. Therefore, the 35 USC 102 rejections to claims 1, 16, 24 and 31 stands.

### Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/603,588

Art Unit: 2821

Inquires

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Huedung Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-

1939.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Don Wong, can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Huedung Cao Patent Examiner

WILSON LEE
DDIMAEN EYAMINER

Page 7